

REMARKS

Claims 134-172 remain in the present application. Claims 84-133 are cancelled herein. Claims 134-172 are added herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of these claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

Examiner Interview Summary

A telephonic Examiner Interview was conducted on February 24, 2009 between Examiner Kevin Nguyen and Applicants' representatives Bryan M. Failing and Anthony C. Murabito and continued on March 5, 2009 between Examiner Bipin Shalwala, Examiner Kevin Nguyen and Applicants' representative Bryan M. Failing. It was agreed during the Examiner Interview that the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of Claims 108-119 and 133 would be overcome by changing "computer-usable medium" to "computer-readable medium." No other agreement was reached. Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 108-119 and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 108-119 and 133 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of Claims 108-119 and 133 is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 108-119 and 133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 108-119 and 133 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection of Claims 108-119 and 133 is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Number 6,100,862 to Sullivan (referred to herein as “Sullivan”). Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-132 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §102 rejection of Claims 84-86, 89-91, 93-98, 101-103, 105-107, 120-123, 126-127 and 130-132 is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129

Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of United States Patent Number 6,468,157 to Hinami et al. (referred to herein as “Hinami”). Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 88, 92, 100, 104, 124 and 129 is moot.

Claims 87, 99 and 128

Claims 87, 99 and 128 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan in view of United States Patent Number 6,246,407 to Wilks et al. (referred to herein as “Wilks”). Claims 87, 99 and 128 are cancelled herein, and thus, Applicants respectfully submit that a discussion of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of Claims 87, 99 and 128 is moot.

Claims 134-172

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 134 which recites a system comprising (emphasis added):

a multi-component display comprising:
a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels, wherein said first display screen is configured to display a visual indicator using said first plurality of pixels; and
a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels, wherein said first and second display screens overlap; and
a user interface component comprising a user-selectable input component, wherein said user-selectable input component is configured to move said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component, and wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen.

Independent Claims 147 and 160 recite elements similar to independent Claim 134. Claims 135-146 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 147 which recites a method of using a multi-component display comprising (emphasis added):

displaying a visual indicator using a first plurality of pixels of a first display screen of said multi-component display, wherein said multi-component display further comprises a second display screen, wherein said first and second display screens overlap, and wherein said second display screen comprises a second plurality of pixels;
detecting a first user interaction with a user interface component, wherein said user interface component comprises a user-selectable input component, and wherein said detecting further comprises detecting a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component; and
in response to said detecting a first user interaction, moving said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane, wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen.

Independent Claim 160 recites elements similar to independent Claim 147.

Claims 148-159 and 161-172 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further elements of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “wherein said first display screen is configured to display a visual indicator using said first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “displaying a visual indicator using a first plurality of pixels of a first display screen of said multi-component display,” “wherein said multi-component display further comprises a second display screen,” “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” and “wherein said second display screen comprises a second plurality of pixels” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Sullivan to teach projecting an image (e.g., 82, 84, etc.) onto an optical element (e.g., 36,

38, etc.) of a stack of optical elements (Abstract; Figures 4-7), where each of the optical elements includes a single pixel (col. 8, lines 14-16). For example, Sullivan teaches that each of optical elements 36-42 is a single-pixel LCD (col. 8, lines 14-16). Accordingly, assuming *arguendo* that optical elements as taught by Sullivan are analogous to a first display screen and a second display screen as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches display screens each with *only one pixel* instead of each with a *plurality of pixels* as claimed. Further, assuming *arguendo* that projection of images onto optical elements as taught by Sullivan is analogous to displaying a visual indicator as claimed, Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches displaying a visual indicator using a *single pixel* instead of a *plurality of pixels* as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “wherein said first display screen is configured to display a visual indicator using said first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “displaying a visual indicator using a first plurality of pixels of a first display screen of said multi-component display,” “wherein said multi-component display further comprises a second display screen,” “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” and “wherein said second display screen comprises a second plurality of pixels” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hinami and/or Wilks, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, fail to cure the deficiencies of Sullivan discussed herein. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Hinami and/or Wilks, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a first display screen comprising a first plurality of pixels,” “wherein said first display screen is configured to display a visual indicator using said first plurality of pixels,” “a second display screen comprising a second plurality of pixels” and “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “displaying a visual indicator using a first plurality of pixels of a first display screen of said multi-component display,” “wherein said multi-component display further comprises a second display screen,” “wherein said first and second display screens overlap” and “wherein said second display screen comprises a second plurality of pixels” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a user interface component comprising a user-selectable input component,” “wherein said user-selectable input component is configured to move said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “detecting a first user interaction with a user interface component,” “wherein said user interface component comprises a user-selectable input component,”

“wherein said detecting further comprises detecting a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component,” “in response to said detecting a first user interaction, moving said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Sullivan of a user interface component including a user-selectable input component configured to move the visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with the user-selectable input component as claimed. Additionally, Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Sullivan of a user interface component including a user-selectable input component configured to move the visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with the user-selectable input component, where *the first plane corresponds to the first display screen*, as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Sullivan fails to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a user interface component comprising a user-selectable input component,” “wherein said user-selectable input component is configured to move said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “detecting a first user interaction with a user interface component,” “wherein said user interface component comprises a user-selectable input component,”

“wherein said detecting further comprises detecting a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component,” “in response to said detecting a first user interaction, moving said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

Applicants respectfully submit that Hinami and/or Wilks, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, fail to cure the deficiencies of Sullivan discussed herein. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Hinami and/or Wilks, either alone or in combination with Sullivan, also fail to teach or suggest the combination of elements, for example, of “a user interface component comprising a user-selectable input component,” “wherein said user-selectable input component is configured to move said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane in response to a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claim 134 and the elements of “detecting a first user interaction with a user interface component,” “wherein said user interface component comprises a user-selectable input component,” “wherein said detecting further comprises detecting a first user interaction with said user-selectable input component,” “in response to said detecting a first user interaction, moving said visual indicator from a first plane to a second plane” and “wherein said first plane corresponds to said first display screen” as recited in independent Claims 147 and 160.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 134, 147 and 160 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan, Hinami and/or Wilks. Since Claims 135-146, 148-159 and 161-172 recite further elements of the embodiments of the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 135-146, 148-159 and 161-172 are also neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Sullivan, Hinami and/or Wilks. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-172 are allowable.

General Remarks

The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are believed to be sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art of record. However, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to respond to one or more of the Examiner's rejections in subsequent amendments should conditions arise warranting such responses.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 134-172 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 5 / 26 / 2009

/BMF/

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060